

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AMARILLO DIVISION

LUIS RAY JARAMILLO, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOE TOVAR, *et al.*,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

2:23-CV-061-Z-BR

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION TO DISMISS  
COMPLAINT AS THREE STRIKES BARRED**

This is a civil rights action brought by Luis Ray Jaramillo, Jr. (“Plaintiff”), a Texas inmate appearing *pro se*, against a state employee pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is an inmate confined in the Connally Unit of TDCJ in Kenedy, Texas, but complains of actions that occurred in the Clements Unit of TDCJ in Amarillo, Texas. While incarcerated, Plaintiff has filed at least three prior civil actions that were dismissed as frivolous or for failure to state a claim. Having reviewed the information submitted, it is clear to the undersigned that Plaintiff is not in imminent danger of serious physical injury, and, therefore, it is recommended that this action be dismissed as barred by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).<sup>1</sup>

The PLRA, enacted into law on April 26, 1996, amended 28 U.S.C. § 1915 as it relates to civil actions filed by prisoners in federal court. Among the changes effected by the PLRA was the inclusion of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), also known as the “three-strike” provision. Section 1915(g)

---

<sup>1</sup> This action was originally filed in the Eastern District of Texas and was styled as a petition for writ of habeas corpus. (ECF 2). However, upon screening, the habeas claims were severed from civil rights claims. (ECF 1). The habeas claims, which remained in the Eastern District, are found in the Complaint. (ECF 2). While the civil rights claims, which were transferred to this district and division, are housed within the Amended Complaint. (ECF 3). The civil rights claims are the subject of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation.

precludes a prisoner from bringing a civil action *in forma pauperis* if on three or more prior occasions, he filed civil actions or appeals in federal court which were dismissed, either by a district court or appellate court, as being frivolous, malicious, or for failing to state a claim. *See Jackson v. Johnson*, 475 F.3d 261, 265 (5th Cir. 2007). When a district court dismisses a case as frivolous or for failure to state a claim, such a dismissal counts as a “strike” under 1915(g) once the judgment becomes final. *See Adepegba v. Hammons*, 103 F.3d 383, 387-88 (5th Cir. 1996). A district court’s dismissal is final when the prisoner has exhausted avenues of appeal or has waived any appellate rights. *Id.*

A prisoner is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis* if he is subject to the “three-strike” provision “unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g); *see also Banos v. O’Guin*, 144 F.3d 883, 884 (5th Cir. 1998). The complaint must present a claim that Plaintiff is in danger of imminent serious physical injury to overcome the bar. *See Carson v. Johnson*, 112 F.3d 818, 822-823 (5th Cir. 1997). In applying the “three-strike” provision of 1915(g), a court may consider case dispositions that occurred prior to the effective date of the PLRA. *See Adepegba*, 103 F.3d at 387-88. A review of PACER reflects that Plaintiff had the following prior actions dismissed with prejudice as frivolous or for failure to state a claim:

- a. No. 5:03-cv-333 (N.D. Tex.) (dismissed on May 24, 2005 as frivolous);
- b. No. 9:10-cv-063 (E.D. Tex.) (dismissed on November 5, 2010 as frivolous);  
and
- c. No. 5:09-cv-232 (W.D. Tex.) (dismissed on June 12, 2019 as frivolous).<sup>2</sup>

Furthermore, Plaintiff has not alleged imminent harm of any kind that would entitle him to evade dismissal of this action. *Banos v. O’Guin*, 144 F.3d 883, 884 (5th Cir. 1998).

---

<sup>2</sup> *See also* No. 6:22-cv-256 (E.D. Tex.) (dismissed on July 19, 2022 as three strikes barred).

RECOMMENDATION

For the above reasons, it is the recommendation of the undersigned that the complaint filed by Plaintiff be dismissed as barred by the three strikes provision of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). This recommendation is without prejudice to Plaintiff's right to reopen the case if he pays the \$402.00 filing and administrative fees and files a motion to reopen within thirty days of the date of final judgment.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE

The United States District Clerk is directed to send a copy of these Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation to each party by the most efficient means available.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

ENTERED July 27, 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LEE ANN RENO  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**\* NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT \***

Any party may object to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation. In the event parties wish to object, they are hereby NOTIFIED that the deadline for filing objections is fourteen (14) days from the date of filing as indicated by the "entered" date directly above the signature line. Service is complete upon mailing, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(C), or transmission by electronic means, Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b)(2)(E). **Any objections must be filed on or before the fourteenth (14th) day after this recommendation is filed** as indicated by the "entered" date. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d).

Any such objections shall be made in a written pleading entitled "Objections to the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation." Objecting parties shall file the written objections with the United States District Clerk and serve a copy of such objections on all other parties. A party's failure to timely file written objections shall bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings, legal conclusions, and recommendation set forth by the Magistrate Judge and accepted by the district court. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), *as recognized in ACS Recovery Servs., Inc. v. Griffin*, 676 F.3d 512, 521 n.5 (5th Cir. 2012); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276-77 (5th Cir. 1988).